

**ACQUITTAL IS
EXPECTED
FOR BURNS
AND LEHON**

Detectives' Answer to
Con-

tempt Charge
Probably Will

Clear Them

The hearing of the charge of contempt of Court against William J. Burns and Dan S. Lehon, his lieutenant in the Frank investigation, which was set for Friday, was postponed until next week, with no definite date fixed.

Lehon and Burns, through their Attorneys, Little, Powell, Hooper & Goldstein, have filed an answer to the contempt charge, which Attorneys generally believe fully purges them of any contempt, even if there was a Prima Facie Case against them. As a result, it is expected the hearing will be extremely short and the charge in all probability dismissed.

The answer of Burns and Lehon develops the interesting fact that they were advised by Attorneys Luther Z. Rosser and Reuben R. Arnold that there was not the slightest impropriety or illegality in their conduct in sending the witness, Annie Maud Carter, out of the city, but that it was the appropriate and proper thing to do under the circumstances.

WAS AIDING THE COURT.

The answer says: "Deponent believes that in so doing (sending the witness out of town) he was serving the cause of right and justice, and was aiding the Court in the ascertainment of truth, and was in no wise intending any contempt of Court or of its processes, but was endeavoring to assist the Court in having its witnesses brought into Court free from any improper influence being exerted upon them."

The answer set out that nothing beyond the expenses of the woman, was paid to her, and that it was well under the ethics of the situation, that where a witness is being detained for the use of a party, that it is proper that the party should pay the expenses actually incurred, and that if the defendant had not voluntarily paid the expenses that he would have been legally liable for them.

The defendant was acting in good faith and honestly endeavoring to assist rather than obstruct the Court, the answer says.

Lehon sets out that when he first saw Annie Maud Carter, she was in the office of Attorneys Herbert and Leonard Haas and that she had just made the affidavit in the Frank Case, and was expressing fear that when the fact became known that she was a

witness for Frank that she would be subjected to violence, or coercion or imprisonment by the city detectives, and they (Burns and Lehon) had to guarantee that she would be protected before she signed the affidavit.

WOMAN WAS SCARED.

The woman was badly frightened, the answer sets out, and it was feared if not kept under surveillance she would run away and not be present at the Court if she was needed at any time to give oral testimony. With that in view, two Burns operatives were ordered to guard her night and day.

The answer then sets out that because of this surveillance and protection, Lehon was enabled to get the woman back to the city and turn her over to the sheriff of the county, when the Court ordered her brought back to its jurisdiction.

She was a witness for the defense, the paper sets out, and it was considered necessary to keep her whereabouts known to the defendant and his counsel, and to keep her where she was free from being tampered with by adverse interests.

Lehon is still in the city, ready to attend any hearing, but Burns, who is in New York, will probably not return unless his personal appearance in Court is desired by Judge Hill.
